

#12

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/438,944

Applicant(s)

Stewart, M. et al.

Examiner

DeCloux, Amy

Group Art Unit

1644



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DeCloux, Amy(3) Stewart, Michael(2) Bundren, William

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 1, 2001Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Claim(s) discussed: all pending

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant was notified that the amendment filed 10/11/01, which was a copy of that filed by applicant on 7/23/01, does not contain a clean copy of the amended claims and therefore is non responsive. The substance of the newly amended claims in said amendment, which has not been entered was discussed. Applicant agreed to consider clarifying the amended portion of newly amended claim 13, changing the dependency of newly amended claims 17-21, which depend on newly cancelled claim 16, removing the terms "peptide mimetic", and "VEGF-like molecule" recited in claim 21, and the term "functional equivalents" from newly amended claim 17, bolstering enablement issues concerning administration of the recited bifunctional binding agent, said issues having been newly raised during the interview, and further distinguishing applicant's invention from the art by Thorpe and by Huang, cited in the 102 and 103 rejections of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.